

-----Original Message-----

**From:** sheri hafer [mailto:somethingsfishy@charter.net]

**Sent:** Saturday, February 12, 2005 9:36 AM

**To:** MLPAComments@resources.ca.gov

**Subject:** MLPAComments: Criteria for central coast study region

Melissa here are a few comments on the criteria doc sent out.

1. Human activity boundaries for **commercial fishing is not restricted to close to port**. A large percentage of the landings are from areas 50 miles or more from port. (ie Big Sur and Pt Conception area)
2. Why isn't dungenous crab or salmon listed as a fishery withing the human activity/ commercial fishing boundary on the central coast?
3. Why aren't areas of common sewage leaking listed as human activity boundaries? (ie Los Osos, San Simeon)
4. Why do you report a moderately high amount of local research? We would like to see it. Just last year the central coast was listed under the Nearshore Fishery Management Plan as **"data poor"**. NOAA listed several informational gaps in the recent stock assessments done on cabezon and link cod including regional Essential Fishery Information. We have little or any regional historical baseline data. How do we know if there is a need for more reserves? What studies have been done on the affect of the recent NFMP quotas and closures? The central coast used to have the largest nearshore fishery in the state and now we have been reduced to a skeleton few fisherman. When I travel to Big Sur for spot prawns, I never see another soul fishing. I am one of only a handful of fisherman left on the central coast. I think you are wasting alot of time and money for nothing.

Also, want to make a comment that the nearshore fishery is a **catch and release fishery**. Size limits were set by dfg allowing many fish harvested to be returned alive and healthy. We have been mandated to take Federal Observers the last 4-5 years to prove this. Look at our records they show a 1-2%bycatch rate. It is one of the cleanest fisheries in the world. This is true of other nearshore fisheries as well ( ie. urchins, sheephead, lobster). I think it is essential that fisherman that have modified their harvesting techniques to promote a sustainable fishery should be recognized. Show us the regional local data proving declines in the nearshore fishery. We see an abundance of everything. Until you prove there is a problem you are not getting the support of the local fisherman for the need for more reserves.

Also, want to comment on the language in the MLPA stating there is only 14 miles of reserves in California. This is an understatement. Vandenberg is 12 miles and Diablo 2 miles. When all the true area of no-take fishing as well as areas unfishable or not fished for some reason are listed, you will find the the percentage of **areas actually fished in the south central region is relatively small** Persons pushing form more MPA's don't want to use that perspective but I think it is important to identify.

Tom Hafer